

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed November 7, 2006, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-12, drawn to a process.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction requirement because the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish distinctness.

In particular, MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. It is respectfully submitted that it would be necessary to search in all Classes and subclasses identified in paragraph 1 at page 2 of the outstanding Official Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Election requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

If the Examiner does not withdraw the complete restriction requirement, then the Applicants believe that at least claims 13, 15, 16 and 18-21 should be rejoined in the election because these article claims are made by the process claims. For the above reasons, this restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

No additional fee is due. However, if any additional fee is due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 13077-00100-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Ashley I. Pezzner

Registration No.: 35,646

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 658-9141

Attorney for Applicant